

Date: Tue, 12 Oct 93 04:30:16 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #373  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Tue, 12 Oct 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    373

Today's Topics:

                    Enough of the debate.  
            Getting my license. Do I want to be like this?  
                    High frequency!  
    Homophobic nonsense and ham radio (was Re: Newsline #842)  
        If you're going to fight about it, spell it correctly!  
                    Temporary ID's?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Mon, 11 Oct 93 13:52:21 GMT  
From: walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Enough of the debate.  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article yBZuac1w165w@beagle.UUCP> chandler@beagle.UUCP (Jim Chandler) writes:

>Let's stop the senseless bickering about the value of CW as it pertains  
>to amateur radio. The facts are these:  
>

>1. The no-code license is here to stay, whether you like it or not. I  
>personally think it is ok. It got me interested in amateur radio.  
>

>2. If you want access to the HF bands, you must learn the code. Until this  
>international law is changed, the requirement will remain.

That's true for a minimal requirement only. I think much of the code/no code  
debate has been highly distorted. I think there are many no-code

licensees that are not opposed to meeting the "minimal" international treaty requirement (generally accepted at or about 5wpm), but find the USA requirement of 13/20wpm to gain the majority of HF access, especially non-CW band segments, to be a highly discriminatory pass/fail roadblock to such access. In fact, I think most people aren't even opposed to keeping the 20wpm requirement for access to those CW only segments for the extra class, BUT see no reason why such a unique "filter" should be in place to gain access to non-CW HF band segments.

>3. That makes CW a right of passage to the HF bands. Whether it is fair or >not is irrelevant.

>

>If you don't like the current license structure, then petition the FCC to >change it. CW has merit, as does RTTY, AMTOR, Packet, SSB, etc. Whether >it will remain as a requirement for access to the HF bands remains to be >seen. I personally would like to see some CW requirement remain, not >necessarily the current ones. I would also like to see the tests updated >and emphasize operating practice, FCC rules and technical aspects of the hobby.

No argument with you there.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

-----  
Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)  
Morristown, NJ                      email via UUCP              bcr!cc!whs70  
201-829-2879 Weekdays              email via Internet      whs70@cc.bellcore.com

-----  
Date: Mon, 11 Oct 1993 11:16:22 -0700  
From: orca.es.com!cnn.sim.es.com!msanders.sim.es.com!user@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Getting my license. Do I want to be like this?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Discrimination against no-code licensees

>

I agree with Drew, VK3XU. In the Salt Lake City area we welcome all new licensees as new blood into the Amateur group. We take special care to welcome them onto the air, ask questions, encourage them to join our round tables, and let them know that if they are listening to our commute group in the mornings and afternoons, that they ought to jump in and contribute. We have some great operators who are only 14 - 16, who put some of the "oldsters" to shame with their correct operating procedures. We also talk to them warmly to help them with procedures, how to pass on to the next in the round table, give them advice on equipment, etc. How better can you help the hobby than by properly guiding the newcomers? If an individual doesn't want to mess with them at all, just go to the frequencies where the

newcomers have no privileges. If you really want to help out, go after the illegal users, not those who are properly contributing!

I did my 5 wpm for my Novice, then upgraded to Tech, and am currently working on my 13 wpm (maybe pass my code on 20 Oct - already passed General written), but I have no objections to anyone who decides not to learn code, or who hasn't gotten their speed up yet. I have two sons who have passed no-code tech and are waiting for their licenses, and one is now interested in code because he watches me doing CW on HF. If someone wants to, fine; if they don't, fine also. Each of us has our own interests and talents, and should not be denied access to anything that the rules allow. Nuf said from me.

Welcome to Amateur Radio

Milt

--

=====

Opinions, thoughts, &cetera are my own and not representative of Evans & Sutherland.

"He flies the sky  
Like an Eagle in the eye  
of a hurricane that's abandoned."

KB7MSF  
Amateur Radio  
"Sandman"

America  
  
Salt Lake City Utah

work: (801) 582-5847 ext 6530  
FAX: 5848  
home: (801) 224-1757

-----

Date: Mon, 11 Oct 1993 20:25:34 GMT  
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!TAMUTS.TAMU.EDU!news.utdallas.edu!corpgate!nrtpa038!bnr.ca!harp@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: High frequency!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Oct9.162925.14132@mixcom.mixcom.com> kevin.jessup  
<kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:  
>From: kevin.jessup <kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com>  
>Subject: High frequency!  
>Date: Sat, 9 Oct 1993 16:29:25 GMT  
>In <2419@arrl.org> bbattles@arrl.org (Brian Battles WS10) writes:  
>  
>

```
>> "*****"
>> Brian Battles, WS10      I Tel      203-666-1541, ext 222 I  "Radio amateurs
>> QST Features Editor      I Fax      203-665-7531          I  do it with high
>> ARRL HQ                  I Internet bbattles@arrl.org      I      frequency"
>> Newington, CT USA        I Amprnet  ws1o@ws1o.ampr.org [44.88.0.87]
>> "*****"
```

>

>Nice sig!

>

>How about: "Radio amateurs do it with frequency, until it Hertz!"

>

>I believe that is similar to an old line used by various  
>electrical engineering departments/frats at univeristies  
>around the country.

>

>--

>Kevin Jessup !politically\_correct

>-----

> The U.S. Constitution defines the rights the people

> give to the government, not the reverse!

I once had a bumper sticker that read "HAMS DO IT TIL THEIR GIGAHERTZ"

```
*****
* Alan Harp K4PB          *      Bell-Northern Research      *      CW FOREVER      *
* mail: harp@bnr.ca      *      Research Triangle Park, NC  *      *
*****
```

-----

Date: 12 Oct 93 00:04:51 GMT

From: rtech!ingres!garys@decwrl.dec.com

Subject: Homophobic nonsense and ham radio (was Re: Newsline #842)

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <29ch44INNf3@abyss.West.Sun.COM>, myers@cypress.West.Sun.COM (Dana Myers ) writes:

>In article 22186@pony.Ingres.COM, garys@Ingres.COM (Gary Swiger) writes:

>>In article <29c297INNds@abyss.West.Sun.COM>, myers@cypress.West.Sun.COM (Dana Myers ) writes:

>>>In article Mp2@news.Hawaii.Edu, jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:

>>>

>>>>If a band of child molesters or a group that practices bestiality (sex  
>>>>with animals) wanted to place an ad in QST I would hope the ARRL would  
>>>>firmly say 'NO!'. Now, from what I see here on campus, the gay lifestyle means  
>>>>two or more men getting together and performing anal and or oral sex  
>>>>on each other in the men's restrooms; I won't even begin to describe the  
>>>>stains they leave on the walls of the toilet stalls. Whether one is a

molester,  
>>>>'loves' animals or is gay it still means subscribing to a deviant and  
nauseating  
>>>>behavior. Many states still have anti-sodomy laws on the books; why should  
>>>>QST or any other magazine be forced to advertise a special interest group  
>>>>who's actions clearly violate the law's of a state in which the magazine is  
>>>>being sold?  
>>>  
>>>Ahem. If your only exposure to the "gay lifestyle" happens to be in the  
>>>men's restrooms at your school, then I'd suggest you need to withhold blanket  
>>>judgement until you have a little more perspective.  
>>>  
>>>To begin with, equating homosexual conduct with child molestation shows a  
>>>limited mindset. Child molestation victimizes a child; consensual sex  
>>>between adults victimizes no one.  
>>  
>>I think what was being said is that homosexual conduct is just another form of  
>>deviant sexual behavior... I would add - it also continues to bring down our  
>>country's values to a new low...  
>  
>Why, thank you, Gary. If I did have trouble comprehending Jeff's point,  
>you would have cleared it up. However, I had no problem understanding  
>Jeff's point.  
>  
>I happen to think intolerance continues to bring our country's values to  
>a new low.

Quite the contrary - too much tolerance continues to bring our country's values to  
a new low. I guess the new liberal mind-set is to tolerate everything in the  
world except intolerance itself.

Anyway - enough of this debate which won't lead anywhere except away from amateur  
radio...

>  
>---  
> \* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD 466 | Views expressed here are  
\*  
> \* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily  
\*  
> \* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
> \* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*  
>

-----

Date: 9 Oct 93 04:41:01 GMT

From: ogicse!emory!rsiatl!jgd@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: If you're going to fight about it, spell it correctly!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

julian@bongo.tele.com (J. M. E. Baudot) writes:

> Even the shore stations are dropping it. But the geezers live  
>on in amateur radio. I am suprised they don't ride horses to work. But  
>then most of them are retired and think creeping around in a golf fart  
>is pretty damn exciting.

Ever notice how obnoxious these old geezers on their electric geez-mobiles  
are making hamfests these days? One or two of 'em can block a whole  
row for hours as they geeze along at about half the speed of frozen  
molasses. I'm waiting for science to discover the rather obvious  
link between Morris use and senility. Almost makes one want to engage  
in geezer tipping.

John

--

John De Armond, WD40QC | For a free sample magazine, send  
Performance Engineering Magazine(TM) | a digest-size 52 cent SASE  
Marietta, Ga "Hotrods'n'computers" | (Domestic) to PO Box 669728  
jgd@dixie.com "What could be better?" | Marietta, GA 30066  
Email may be published at my sole discretion.

-----  
Date: 11 Oct 93 08:20:57 EDT  
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Temporary ID's?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, rossi@VFL.Paramax.COM (Pete Rossi) writes:

>  
>Now for a related question.....  
>  
>Has anyone ever heard of anyone having a problem [notification from the FCC]  
>for not using their temporary upgrade suffix? A friend of mine upgraded to  
>Advanced back in the spring and I remember hearing him a few times in the  
>Advanced band in DX pileups, etc, and once in a while, in the "heat of battle"  
>he forgot his /AA suffix. I am sure it happens but has the FCC ever caught  
>anyone? Do they really care?

Subsequent to President Regan having signed Public Law 97-251 into  
law, the FCC is now allowed by Congress (and routinely does) enlist  
the aid of the Amateur Auxiliary to the FCC's Field Operations Bureau  
for Amateur Radio Service "problems" like that.

And this is good. Because we have about 700 members of the Amateur Auxiliary. Far better that we police ourselves, just like tradition -- and fiscal matters! -- seem to demand in this day and age.

To answer your question, though, yes, FCC does really care. But they most often leave the evidence-gathering to our own Amateur Radio licensees who have been trained and certified into the Amateur Auxiliary. It leaves them free(er) to do the things that are important. Like the dozen or so fines (Notices of Apparent Liability, actually) that I noticed last week alone.

			Deputy Manager, Field Services, ARRL.
		----	The ARRL Amateur Radio Emergency Service, the ARRL
	uck		urder
-----			National Traffic System, The Amateur Auxiliary to
			the FCC's Field Operations Bureau, the ARRL
	KY1T		Field Organization and the ARRL Monitoring System.

-----  
lhurder@arrl.org Prodigy - MGTS39A, BIX - ARRL,  
MCI Mail - RPALM, MCI Mail - "ARRL", America On Line - "ARRL HQ"  
Compuserve - 70007,3373 (ARRL HQ) -- Genie ARRL.HQ

-----  
Date: Mon, 11 Oct 1993 08:53:28 -0700  
From: ftpbox!mothost!schbbs!node\_142cf.aieg.mot.com!user@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CEHJBD.C5s@pica.army.mil>,  
<rcrw90-071093105243@node\_142cf.aieg.mot.com>, <4644@eram.esi.COM.AU>  
Subject : Re: Getting my license. Do I want to be like this?

In article <4644@eram.esi.COM.AU>, dave@esi.COM.AU (Dave Horsfall) wrote:

> In article <rcrw90-071093105243@node\_142cf.aieg.mot.com>,  
> rcrw90@email.mot.com (Mike Waters) writes:  
>  
> | [ ... ] there was an infamouds  
> | individual in NY state who would spend all day (no kidding) calling "CQ A1  
> | operators only No kids no lids no school bus riders ..."  
>  
> Ah yes - I've heard about him, some old W-call or other.

Thats him, a 1X2, but I forget the actual call.

> | He did this for some 10 years until he died - I am told from unrelated  
> | causes :-)

>  
> Did they have to prise the key from his cold, dead hand?

KEY!!!!!! A1 operators only use SSB! I actuall heard him say that one  
afternoon :-) He was fun to listen to for short periods. I never did  
call him though, it might have been good for a few war stories :-)

--  
Mike Waters rcrw90@email.mot.com AA4MW@KC7Y.PHX.AZ.US.NA

BEST BENT WIRE SK

-----  
Date: Mon, 11 Oct 1993 14:16:15 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!mixcom.com!  
kevin.jessup@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Oct9.162925.14132@mixcom.mixcom.com>,  
<mZ56ac1w165w@mystis.wariat.org>, <CEpJrE.6LG@mentor.cc.purdue.edu>~  
Subject : Re: High frequency!

In <CEpJrE.6LG@mentor.cc.purdue.edu> blumb@sage.cc.purdue.edu (Bill Blum) writes:

>>kevin.jessup <kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:  
>>> Nice sig!  
>>>  
>>> How about: "Radio amateurs do it with frequency, until it Hertz!"  
>>  
>>Does that mean that NO-CODERS do it with VERY HIGH FREQUENCY? Or even  
>>ULTRA HIGH FREQUENCY?

>Unfortunately, nocoders can't go the required DISTANCE for some people...

Nothing wrong with occaisionally going the distance,  
but as a "no-coder", I prefer a quick "kerchunk"  
now and then! ;-)))

--  
Kevin Jessup !politically\_correct

-----  
The U.S. Constitution defines the rights the people  
give to the government, not the reverse!

-----  
Date: Mon, 11 Oct 1993 08:30:28 -0700



From: ftpbox!mothost!schbbs!node\_142cf.aieg.mot.com!user@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <rcrw90-071093111059@node\_142cf.aieg.mot.com>,  
<rcrw90-081093083820@node\_142cf.aieg.mot.com>, <CEnCJn.5pK@news.Hawaii.Edu>  
Subject : Re: Enough of the debate.

In article <CEnCJn.5pK@news.Hawaii.Edu>, jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu  
(Jeff Herman) wrote:

> In article <rcrw90-081093083820@node\_142cf.aieg.mot.com> rcrw90@email.mot.com  
(Mike Waters) writes:

> >Well what is needed is a "petition for a proposed rulemaking" to the FCC.

> Mike, I guess there will be two petitions that will be filed: one asking  
> for the elimination, and the other requesting the reinstatement of the  
> code requirement for all classes of licenses.

I for one would regard that as a positive thing too! I would be very  
interested in reading the "reinstate" petition, especially the part about  
justifying a CW test over all the other possibilities. i.e. "Why CW?"

I suspect that any petition which did not address that issue would last  
about as long as the legendary "ban prayer from radio" petition. There  
really was one, filed in 1948 and dismissed without a hearing as being  
beyond the FCC's authority. I have seen two petitions opposing it in the  
last few years even so! The FCC estimated that it is costing over \$2M/year  
telling people this though, conspiracy theories die hard.

I hope we don't get into something as futile in the "no-code" debate!

--

Mike Waters rcrw90@email.mot.com AA4MW@KC7Y.PHX.AZ.US.NA

-----

Date: Mon, 11 Oct 1993 08:39:53 -0700  
From: ftpbox!mothost!schbbs!node\_142cf.aieg.mot.com!user@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2531@indep1.UUCP>, <ZPa5ac1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>,  
<2536@indep1.UUCP>g.gtefsd  
Subject : Re: Enough of the debate.

In article <2536@indep1.UUCP>, clifto@indep1.UUCP (Cliff Sharp) wrote:

> I sure wish I could get a copy of one of those exams (there were five

> different versions, all kept secret) to post to the net just for >show-and-tell.

No they weren't, that is one reason the current format was adopted.

Have you heard of Dick Bash? He would question people who had just taken the test about the questions and then publish them together with the correct answers. As a result it became trivial to cheat by memorizing all five sets of answers, a total of about 50 items as I recall. Today you have to memorize 2-300 and the order of the questions is scrambled so you \_have\_ to memorize the content, not just the answer codes.

Now if you had to take the test \*I\* passed in 1961 ... :-)

--

Mike Waters rcrw90@email.mot.com AA4MW@KC7Y.PHX.AZ.US.NA

-----

Date: 12 Oct 93 05:11:18 GMT

From: ddsww1!indep1!clifto@uunet.uu.net

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <ZPa5ac1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>, <2536@indep1.UUCP>,

<rcrw90-111093083953@node\_142cf.aieg.mot.com>dep1

Subject : Re: Enough of the debate.

In article <rcrw90-111093083953@node\_142cf.aieg.mot.com> rcrw90@email.mot.com (Mike Waters) writes:

>In article <2536@indep1.UUCP>, clifto@indep1.UUCP (Cliff Sharp) wrote:

>> I sure wish I could get a copy of one of those exams (there were five  
>> different versions, all kept secret) to post to the net just for >show-and-tell.

>

>No they weren't, that is one reason the current format was adopted.

>

>Have you heard of Dick Bash? He would question people who had just taken  
>the test about the questions and then publish them together with the  
>correct answers. As a result it became trivial to cheat by memorizing all

Yes, as a matter of fact I was trying to recall that name the other day. Bash and his "cheat" guides came after 1965; if I remember right, it all started happening around 1967 or 1968.

As I remember it, he was catching testees as they left the FCC offices and offering \$5 for every question they could remember well, putting the answers together and publishing the whole shebang. FCC was indeed keeping it secret; but some people needed those \$5 bills pretty badly, I guess, and despite being told the test was not for publication (in the study guides, by other hams, in writing on the test booklet) helped bring the Bash guides into existence.

>five sets of answers, a total of about 50 items as I recall. Today you

As I recall it, it was either 25 or 50 questions per test element,  
so that's a total of either 125 or 250 items.

>Now if you had to take the test \*I\* passed in 1961 ... :-)

That's the test I studied for. The only reason it took me until 1965  
was that I had trouble learning the code on my own, and it wasn't until  
1965 that I was able to get to Allied Radio (or even knew about it) and  
join up with a group that did code practice and gave the Novice tests  
(FCC didn't back then, and I didn't know any hams). When I went down  
for the General test, I came prepared to draw schematics and explain them  
to the examiners; I didn't know that had been eliminated by that time.

Anecdote: it was late 1965 or early 1966 when I went for my first stab  
at General. I could copy 12.99 WPM, but that "infernial machine" (the  
polite-company term for the code-sending machine) made me so nervous  
that I don't think I got 10 seconds' solid copy. I was 15 years old,  
and I must've looked like I was gonna cry or something, because the  
examiner asked me if I'd like to take the Tech test (which the FCC also  
didn't usually administer back then). I did, I passed in a flash, and  
I was halfway home before I realized that I now possessed no gear that  
I was licensed to use! Talk about incentives for upgrading...! :-)

--

```
+-----+
|  Cliff Sharp  |      clifto@indep1.chi.il.us   OR  clifto@indep1.uucp   |
|    WA9PDM     |                        Use whichever one works          |
+-----+
```

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #373

\*\*\*\*\*